



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/628,770

07/28/2003

Arnold J. Levine

P1176R1C1

5778

9157

7590

05/11/2006

GENENTECH, INC.

1 DNA WAY

SOUTH SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94080

EXAMINER

HOLLERAN, ANNE L

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

1643

DATE MAILED: 05/11/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/628,770

Applicant(s)

LEVINE ET AL.

Examiner

Anne L. Holleran

Art Unit

1643

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 1 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-43 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☒ Claim(s) 1-43 are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on ____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. ____. |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date ____. | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: ____. |

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

1. Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. 121:
 - I. Claims 1-12 and 20 drawn to clone 65 polynucleotides, vectors, and host cells classified in class 435, subclass 69.1.
 - II. Claims 13-17, 21, 38 and 40, drawn to clone 65 polypeptides, classified in class 530, subclass 350.
 - III. Claims 18 and 19, drawn to an antibody that binds to a clone 65 polypeptide, and a kit comprising said antibody, classified in class 530, subclass 387.1.
 - IV. Claims 22-34 and 36, drawn to clone 320 polynucleotides, vectors, and host cells classified in class 435, subclass 69.1.
 - V. Claims 35, 37 and 42, drawn to clone 320 polypeptides, classified in class 530, subclass 350.
 - VI. Claims 39 and 41, drawn to antagonists of clone 65 polypeptides, classified in class 514, subclass 2.
 - VII. Claim 43, drawn to antagonists of clone 320 polypeptides, classified in class 514, subclass 2.
2. The inventions are distinct, each from the other, for the following reasons:

Inventions I-III are patentably distinct products.

The polypeptide of group II and polynucleotide of group I are patentably distinct inventions for the following reasons: Polypeptides, which are composed of amino acids, and

Art Unit: 1643

polynucleotides, which are composed of purine and pyrimidine units, are structurally distinct molecules; any relationship between a polynucleotide and polypeptide is dependent upon the information provided by the nucleic acid sequence open reading frame as it corresponds to the primary amino acid sequence of the encoded polypeptide. While a polypeptide of group II can be made by methods using polynucleotides of group I, it can also be recovered from a natural source using biochemical means. For instance, the polypeptide can be isolated using affinity chromatography. For these reasons, the inventions of groups I and II are patentably distinct.

Furthermore, searching the inventions of groups I and II together would impose a serious search burden. In the instant case, the search of the polypeptides and the polynucleotides are not coextensive. The inventions of Groups I and II have a separate status in the art as shown by their different classifications. In cases such as this one where descriptive sequence information is provided, the sequences are searched in appropriate databases. There is search burden also in the non-patent literature. Prior to the concomitant isolation and expression of the sequence of interest there may be journal articles devoted solely to polypeptides, which would not have described the polynucleotide. Similarly, there may have been "classical" genetics papers that had no knowledge of the polypeptide but spoke to the gene. Searching, therefore is not coextensive. In addition, the polypeptide claims include polypeptides having 70% identity to the sequence identified. This search requires an extensive analysis of the art retrieved in a sequence search and will require an in-depth analysis of technical literature. As such, it would be burdensome to search the inventions of groups I and II together.

The polypeptide of group II and the antibody of group III are patentably distinct for the following reasons:

While the inventions of both group II and group III are polypeptides, in this instance the polypeptide of group II is a single chain molecule that functions as an enzyme, whereas the polypeptide of group III encompasses antibodies including IgG which comprises 2 heavy and 2 light chains containing constant and variable regions, and including framework regions which act as a scaffold for the 6 complementarity determining regions (CDRs) that function to bind an epitope. Thus the polypeptide of group II and the antibody of group III are structurally distinct molecules; any relationship between a polypeptide of group II and an antibody of group III is dependent upon the correlation between the scope of the polypeptides that the antibody binds and the scope of the antibodies that would be generated upon immunization with the polypeptide. Therefore the polypeptide and antibody are patentably distinct.

Furthermore, searching the inventions of group II and group III would impose a serious search burden. The inventions have a separate status in the art as shown by their different classifications. A polypeptide and an antibody that binds to the polypeptide require different searches. An amino acid sequence search of the full-length protein is necessary for a determination of novelty and unobviousness of the protein. However, such a search is not required to identify the antibodies of group III. Furthermore, antibodies that bind to an epitope of a polypeptide of group II may be known even if a polypeptide of group II is novel. In addition, the technical literature search for the polypeptide of group II and the antibody of group III are not coextensive, e.g., antibodies may be characterized in the technical literature prior to discovery of or sequence of their binding target.

The polynucleotide of group I and the antibody of group III are patentably distinct for the following reasons. The antibody of group III includes, for example, IgG molecules which

Art Unit: 1643

comprise 2 heavy and 2 light chains containing constant and variable regions, and including framework regions which act as a scaffold for the 6 complementarity determining regions (CDRs). Polypeptides, such as the antibody of group II which are composed of amino acids, and polynucleotides, which are composed of nucleic acids, are structurally distinct molecules; any relationship between a polynucleotide and polypeptide is dependent upon the information provided by the nucleic acid sequence open reading frame as it corresponds to the primary amino acid sequence of the encoded polypeptide. In the present claims, a polynucleotide of group I will not encode an antibody of group III, and the antibody of group III cannot be encoded by a polynucleotide of group I. Therefore the antibody and polynucleotide are patentably distinct.

The antibody and polynucleotide inventions have a separate status in the art as shown by their different classifications. Furthermore, searching the inventions of group I and group III would impose a serious search burden since a search of the polynucleotide of group I is would not be used to determine the patentability of an antibody of group III, and vice-versa.

Inventions IV and V are patentably distinct products.

The polypeptide of group IV and polynucleotide of group V are patentably distinct inventions for the following reasons: Polypeptides, which are composed of amino acids, and polynucleotides, which are composed of purine and pyrimidine units, are structurally distinct molecules; any relationship between a polynucleotide and polypeptide is dependent upon the information provided by the nucleic acid sequence open reading frame as it corresponds to the primary amino acid sequence of the encoded polypeptide. While a polypeptide of group II can be made by methods using polynucleotides of group I, it can also be recovered from a natural

Art Unit: 1643

source using by biochemical means. For instance, the polypeptide can be isolated using affinity chromatography. For these reasons, the inventions of groups I and II are patentably distinct.

Furthermore, searching the inventions of groups IV and V together would impose a serious search burden. In the instant case, the search of the polypeptides and the polynucleotides are not coextensive. The inventions of Groups IV and V have a separate status in the art as shown by their different classifications. In cases such as this one where descriptive sequence information is provided, the sequences are searched in appropriate databases. There is search burden also in the non-patent literature. Prior to the concomitant isolation and expression of the sequence of interest there may be journal articles devoted solely to polypeptides, which would not have described the polynucleotide. Similarly, there may have been "classical" genetics papers that had no knowledge of the polypeptide but spoke to the gene. Searching, therefore is not coextensive. In addition, the polypeptide claims include polypeptides having 70% identity to the sequence identified. This search requires an extensive analysis of the art retrieved in a sequence search and will require an in-depth analysis of technical literature. As such, it would be burdensome to search the inventions of groups IV and V together.

Inventions I and IV are unrelated. Inventions are unrelated if it can be shown that they are not disclosed as capable of use together and they have different modes of operation, different functions, or different effects (MPEP § 806.04, MPEP § 808.01). Group I encompasses claims to clone 65 polynucleotides, which encode a separate and distinct polypeptide product from the polypeptide encoded by clone 320 polynucleotides of Group IV. Therefore, entirely different searches of the databases would be required to search both groups, and the searches would not be

Art Unit: 1643

coextensive. As such, it would be burdensome to search the inventions of Groups I and IV together.

Inventions II and V are unrelated. Inventions are unrelated if it can be shown that they are not disclosed as capable of use together and they have different modes of operation, different functions, or different effects (MPEP § 806.04, MPEP § 808.01). Group II encompasses claims to clone 65 polypeptides, which are separate and distinct polypeptide products from the clone 320 polypeptides of Group V. Therefore, entirely different searches of the databases would be required to search both groups, and the searches would not be coextensive. As such, it would be burdensome to search the inventions of Groups II and V together.

Inventions VI and any of I, II or III are directed to related products. The related inventions are distinct if the inventions as claimed do not overlap in scope, i.e., are mutually exclusive; the inventions as claimed are not obvious variants; and the inventions as claimed are either not capable of use together or can have a materially different design, mode of operation, function, or effect. See MPEP § 806.05(j). In the instant case, group VI, drawn to antagonists of clone 65 polypeptides, encompasses products that are separate and distinct from the polynucleotides of Group I, the polypeptides of Group II and the antibody of Group III. An antagonist may be a small organic molecule, a peptide or an antibody with a specific function. Thus, the products of Group VI are defined by a function with no correlation to structure and the search for such products would be very broad and not include a search of a polynucleotide that encodes clone 65 polypeptides, nor include a search of clone 65 polypeptides. The search for

Art Unit: 1643

antagonists might possibly include a search for antibodies that bind to clone 65, but this search would not be the same as a search for group III, because the antibodies in group III are not limited to antibodies with antagonist properties. Similarly, the search for Group VI is not limited to antibodies, because any number of products may have an antagonist function. As such, it would be burdensome to search the inventions of Group VI together with any of Groups I, II or III.

Inventions VII and either IV or V are directed to related products. The related inventions are distinct if the inventions as claimed do not overlap in scope, i.e., are mutually exclusive; the inventions as claimed are not obvious variants; and the inventions as claimed are either not capable of use together or can have a materially different design, mode of operation, function, or effect. See MPEP § 806.05(j). In the instant case, group VII, drawn to antagonists of clone 320 polypeptides, encompasses products that are separate and distinct from the polynucleotides of Group IV and the polypeptides of Group V. An antagonist may be a small organic molecule, a peptide or an antibody with a specific function. Thus, the products of Group VII are defined by a function with no correlation to structure and the search for such products would be very broad and not include a search of a polynucleotide that encodes clone 320 polypeptides, nor include a search of clone 320 polypeptides. As such, it would be burdensome to search the inventions of Group VII together with either Group IV or Group V.

Inventions VII and any of Inventions I, II and III are unrelated. Inventions are unrelated if it can be shown that they are not disclosed as capable of use together and they have different designs, modes of operation, and effects (MPEP § 802.01 and § 806.06). In the instant case, the

Art Unit: 1643

different inventions do not appear to be capable of use together, because Invention VII is clone 320 polypeptide antagonist, whereas Inventions I, II and III are related to clone 65 polypeptides.

Inventions VI and any of Inventions IV and V are unrelated. Inventions are unrelated if it can be shown that they are not disclosed as capable of use together and they have different designs, modes of operation, and effects (MPEP § 802.01 and § 806.06). In the instant case, the different inventions do not appear to be capable of use together, because Invention VI is clone 65 polypeptide antagonist, whereas Inventions IV and V are related to clone 320 polypeptides.

3. Because these inventions are independent or distinct for the reasons given above and have acquired a separate status in the art because of their recognized divergent subject matter, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

4. A telephone call was made to Diane Marschang on 2/23/2006 to request an oral election to the above restriction requirement, but did not result in an election being made.

Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete must include (i) an election of a species or invention to be examined even though the requirement be traversed (37 CFR 1.143) and (ii) identification of the claims encompassing the elected invention.

The election of an invention or species may be made with or without traverse. To reserve a right to petition, the election must be made with traverse. If the reply does not distinctly and specifically point out supposed errors in the restriction requirement, the election shall be treated as an election without traverse.

Should applicant traverse on the ground that the inventions or species are not patentably distinct, applicant should submit evidence or identify such evidence now of record showing the inventions or species to be obvious variants or clearly admit on the record that this is the case. In either instance, if the examiner finds one of the inventions unpatentable over the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) of the other invention.

Applicant is reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 CFR 1.48(b) if one or more of the currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim remaining in the application. Any amendment of inventorship must be accompanied by a request under 37 CFR 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37 CFR 1.17(i).

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Anne Holleran, whose telephone number is (571) 272-0833. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday from 9:30 am to 5:00 pm. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Larry Helms, can be reached on (571) 272-0832. Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (571) 272-1600.

Papers related to this application may be submitted to Group 1600 by facsimile transmission. The faxing of such papers must conform to the notice published in the Official Gazette, 1096 OG 30 (November 15, 1989). The Official Fax number for Group 1600 is (571) 273-8300.

Art Unit: 1643

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll free).

Anne L. Holleran
Patent Examiner
May 4, 2006



LARRY R. HELMS, PH.D.
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER